

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM Mendota Branch Library 2026

Overall Rating

4

### *Ratings Summary*

<i>BOND ACT CRITERIA</i>	<i>RATING</i>	
Urban and Rural		See Map
Population Growth		234%
Age and Condition	4	
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	3	
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	4	
Appropriateness of site	4	
Financial capacity (new libraries only)		yes

### *Non-Evaluative Comments*

None.

### *Project Summary*

Applicant:	Fresno County
Library Jurisdiction:	Fresno County Public Library
Project Type/Priority:	New Library/1
Project Square Footage:	12,635
State Grant Request:	\$3,546,687

# EVALUATION FORM

## Mendota Branch Library 2026

### Age and Condition of Existing Library

RATING

4

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendices 1 & 3

#### Age Rating

3

4 = No Existing Facility

4 = 1949 or older

3 = 1950-1959

2 = 1960-0964

1 = 1965-1974

0 = 1975-2003

#### Structural Renovation Rating

4

4 = No Renovation

4 = 1954 & earlier

3 = 1955-1962

2 = 1963-1972

1 = 1973-1978

0 = 1979-2003

4 = Extremely Poor Condition

3 = Poor condition

2 = Acceptable condition

1 = Good condition

0 = Very good condition

#### Condition of Existing Library

1. Structural

2. Lighting

3. Energy

4. Health & Safety

5. ADA

6. Acoustical

7. Flexibility

8. Spatial Relationships

9. Site Considerations

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

### Rating panel comments

Library construction date: 1956

Library renovation date: None

R1:

Deficiencies of the current facility include leaking roof and water intrusion through walls, resulting in damaged library materials and the presence of mold; inefficient energy consumption; inadequate space to provide library services for the current user population; and ADA accessibility deficiencies.

## EVALUATION FORM

### Mendota Branch Library 2026

R2:

This 960 square foot single story facility built in 1956 is vulnerable to seismic events and water infiltration through the leaky roof and walls which damages the modest collection of library materials maintained by the library. Energy conservation is negligible due to outdated single pane windows, absence of any insulation in the building and swamp coolers and portable fans which inhibit temperature control. The library has maximized space to full capacity in a greatly undersized building preventing any possible renovation or configuration of space to deal with ADA accessibility issues or address health and safety problems such as asbestos and mold. The video substantiates the facility as a dilapidated unattractive, uncomfortable structure that would not seem to provoke much library patronage except that the community needs and does use the library's services.

R3:

In this 1956,960 square foot, masonry building wheelchair patrons are served outside the building. In addition to being totally ADA noncompliant when a patron does enter the building, they can be in a room hopefully less than 95 degrees. In 2000 a pair of wall air conditioners and two box fans were installed to help in this area. Heat comes from a floor-mounted unit that vents through the wall and can most of time heat the immediately adjacent space. Cracked walls and a leaky roof have introduced mold in the walls and collection. The one open room cannot serve the community needs for computers or collection. Limited stacks are not anchored for seismic standards. The video and narrative data provided documented the conditions quite clearly.

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Mendota Branch Library 2026

### Needs and Response to Needs

Regulatory Basis: 20440 pp. 26, 27, 60-69

RATING

3

#### Community Library Needs Assessment

1. Methodology & community involvement.
2. Community analysis/community agencies & organizations, service area demographics
3. Analysis of service needs/consistency with demographics
4. Service limitations for existing facility (if applicable)
5. Space needs assessment
6. Executive summary includes description of K-12 student population and their needs

R1	R2	R3
2	2	3
3	3	3
3	3	4
3	4	4
3	3	3
3	3	3

#### Library Plan of Service

7. How well project responds to needs of residents
8. How well project responds to needs of K-12 students as expressed in Needs Assessment
9. How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators are documented
10. How well types of services are documented
11. How well types of K-12 services are documented
12. How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
3	3	3
2	2	3
2	2	2
3	2	3
3	2	2

#### Library Building Program

13. How well Building Program implements Plan of Service.
14. How well Building Program documents general requirements for Library Building.
15. How well spatial relationships are described.
16. How well individual spaces are sized and described.

R1	R2	R3
3	4	3
3	4	3
4	4	4
4	4	4

#### Conceptual Plans

17. How well net-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
18. How well non-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
19. How well spatial relationships on plan match Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	3	3

#### Joint Use Cooperative Agreement

20. How well roles & responsibilities are defined.
21. How clearly joint library services are described.
22. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of hours of service.
23. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of staffing/volunteers.
24. How well ownership issues are resolved
25. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of sources & uses of funding
26. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of review & modification process
27. How well agreement demonstrates a workable, mutually beneficial long-term partnership.

R1	R2	R3
2	2	2
2	2	2
2	2	2
2	2	3
2	1	2
1	1	2
1	1	1
2	2	2

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Mendota Branch Library 2026

#### Rating Panel Comments

R1:

**Needs Assessment:**

Appropriate methods of obtaining community input were implemented during the needs assessment process, including obtaining input from non-users. Good analysis of information gathered, resulting in logical library service needs determination. The book allocation results in a very small number of English language adult fiction and non-fiction books, however, the collection breakouts and conversion factors are extremely comprehensive and well documented. Similarly, the allocation and conversion factors used for readers seating is extremely well documented, but the applicant never indicated how the total number of reader's seating was arrived at. A similar issue with technology units as well.

**Plan of Service:**

Planned services respond well to the needs assessment results, and goals and objectives are clear. Service indicators would be more meaningful if they measured quality of the services. The service roles selected may be overly ambitious, but respond to the findings of the needs assessment.

**Joint Use Agreement:**

The hours of service are scant and will not be determined until after the facility opens, making assessment of the adequacy impossible. The review and modification process is adequate, but not proactive. The agreement may be modified or amended only by written agreement and notice of any modifications must be made by July 1 of each year. Each party is contributing to the services, but the library is assuming the primary responsibility.

**Building Program:**

It appears that the building program may not accommodate the amount of Spanish-language required by the plan of service. A very good general requirements section that would have benefited from somewhat more detail and comprehensiveness. The formatting for some of the headings were misplaced in a couple of cases, but this is a minor problem. Exceptional description of the spatial relationships in narrative form. The use of a spatial diagram would have been helpful. The summary of spaces was very brief and at only the division level. Very comprehensive and excellent job of detailing each space description.

**Conceptual Plans:**

Optimal matching of net and non-assignable square footage (Building program @ 25% and plans @ 24%) between the plan with the building program. The conceptual plan appears to meet most of the critical spatial relationships called for in the building program. In some cases, there is no way to tell if the conceptual plans meet the spatial relationships for some of the spaces because the conceptual plans do not break out many of the spaces called for in the building program (e.g., the Children's Area ). However, given that this is such a small library and it appears the spatial relationships have been met in general, this is not a significant problem for this project.

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Mendota Branch Library 2026

R2:

#### **Needs Assessment:**

Methodology and community involvement are adequate. It's a little hard to clearly understand the actual methods used and their specific results. Language is a bit fuzzy. Space needs assessment: Maybe should have more of the collection in Spanish language materials; it appears that about 26% of the books are in Spanish language while 93% of the population is Hispanic. Certainly not all 93% need/want a high proportion of Spanish language materials but it would seem as if more than a quarter of the book collection might go to this. Executive summary is excellent except for some unnecessary duplication of information re computer use sessions.

#### **Plan of Service:**

Service indicators are pretty skimpy and proforma. Good organization of objectives; clearly laid out. Do address stated needs, except maybe more Spanish language materials. Very ambitious: 9 PLA service roles and 179 objectives, to be performed by 3.5 FTE within 33 hours per week. Says that 50% of the adult collection is Spanish language materials; Building programs collection #'s do not seem to add up to that.

#### **Joint Use Agreement:**

Does have some hard dollar contribution from both parties. Still seems to be pretty one -sided, with the library picking up most of the service expense and the District just facilitating its use.

#### **Building Program:**

The Building Program documents extremely well the General Requirements for the project. The individual spaces optimally described and sized. The spatial relationships are described highly effectively. However, a bubble diagram would have enhanced the communication with the architect.

#### **Conceptual Plan:**

The net-assignable and non-assignable SF is an outstanding match with the Building Program requirements. The spatial relationships are very good at matching the Building Program requirements, except in a couple of instances. The Building Program states the Librarian's Office and Conference Room should be adjacent, and the Staff Lounge and Staff Restroom should be adjacent. This is not the case on the plan.

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Mendota Branch Library 2026

#### R3:

##### **Needs Assessment:**

Multi-faceted approach that included information from teachers, parents, students. Have built on previous planning efforts and some of the data is dated, however since the passing of Measure B, there have been more community meetings, etc. and more of an opportunity to update information. Does include non-library users such as migrant farm workers. Plans to increase the Spanish Language collection by 50%--this seems small in light of the demographic data that shows that the Latino population is 93%. There are serious service limitations with the existing facility--there are four computers and there are especially problems in the summer when the computers and the air conditioner are used--apparently there is simultaneous use in the summer.

##### **Plan of Service:**

Nine core service responses are included and they relate to the findings in the needs assessment.

##### **Joint Use Agreement:**

This does not seem to be an equal partnering effort. In this case, the school district has donated a parcel of land.

##### **Building Program:**

General Requirements: Somewhat cursory; many times have something like, "for details see specific areas". Minor problems include: inconsistent references to shelving heights; inconsistent paragraph numbering that makes the program difficult to follow; and explanation of technical terms (e.g., RFID technology) should be included to avoid misunderstandings. Spatial relationships: In general, quite good, but some minor problems (e.g., check-out desk should note line of sight supervision of Young Adults., to correspond with other sections of the building program). Room sheets: Detailed and space appear to be appropriately sized. Some unique inclusions are well stated (e.g., children's program area plumbing)

##### **Conceptual plans:**

Assignable square footage closely matches the building program. Non-assignable square footage at 24% betters the requirement of the building program, which is 25%. Adjacencies meet the building program requirements with only minor discrepancies: the staff restroom is not adjacent to the Staff Lounge; the Branch Managers' office does not appear to be adequately close to a Conference Room; and access to the branch manager's office is via a small vestibule shared with the Staff Lounge, which appears to be inappropriate. Aside from those specific discrepancies, the overall layout looks very sensible and is consistent with the building program.

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Mendota Branch Library 2026

### Integration of Electronic Technologies

**RATING**

**4**

Regulatory Basis: p.68, 20440, Appendix 4

#### Integration of Electronic Technologies

1. Appropriateness of electronic technologies in Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment
2. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in Plan of Service
3. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	3	4
3	4	3

### Rating Panel Comments

R1:

The building program includes a thorough technology discussion in the general requirements section. The PC center will be well-equipped to provide PC training, homework assistance, online tutoring and will provide projection capability. The discussion mentions that reference will transition to electronic formats and the need for flexibility. Video conferencing will be provided, and public access PCs will be more than quadrupled. Raised floor system and wireless technology should provide flexibility for future changes.

R2:

Extensive and detailed. Only problem is that this is more a description than a real working plan. Branch has excellent technology support through Fresno Co. Library and the SJVLS system.

R3:

Propose to increase the number of computers (4 to 19) and to provide a homework center, computer center. Have provided background information about technological needs in San Joaquin Valley Library System (SJVLS) and Heartland Network and how what's being proposed for this project fits into other technological efforts.

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Mendota Branch Library 2026

### Site

Regulatory Basis: p.39, 20440, Appendix 1

RATING

4

#### Appropriateness of Site

1. Equal access for all residents in service area.
2. Accessibility via public transit.
3. Accessibility via pedestrian and bicycle.
4. Accessibility via automobile.
5. Adequacy of automobile parking.
6. Adequacy of bicycle parking.
7. Overall parking rationale.
8. Shared parking agreement (if applicable).
9. Visibility of site & proposed library building in service area
10. How well site fits community context & planning
11. Site selection process and summary.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	3
3	2	2
3	3	3
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	3	3
4	4	4
N/A		
4	4	4
3	3	3
3	3	3

#### Site Description

12. Adequacy of size of site.
13. Appropriateness of site configuration
14. Appropriateness of site/surrounding area.
15. Appropriateness of site based on placement of building, parking, access roads, pathways, expansion and parking.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	3	3
4	4	4

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Mendota Branch Library 2026

#### Rating Panel Comments

**Drainage issues:** Belmont Ave is in a 100 year flood plain, but the library site is not. The library site will be elevated regardless to ensure against any possibility of flooding.

**Geotechnical issues:** The site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Due to the potential expansive nature of some of the soil, some non-expansive engineered fill will need to be imported. This does not appear to mean costly site development for the site.

R1:

The proposed library site is not geographically centrally located in the service area, however, it is appropriately located near the only center of population in this primarily agricultural area. There are several man-made barriers, highways and a railroad, but again, in this primarily rural community, this should not present a problem. As a matter of fact, the proximity to the highways will probably be a benefit in bringing residents in from the outlying areas to use the library.

The proposed library site is on the edge of the existing "downtown" area, but the site is adjacent to the community's main commercial shopping area (grocery) and an elementary, junior high and high school. There is a sidewalk on the south side of Belmont continuing on to the high school. While the site is on the edge of current development, there are future plans to develop more commercial and residential development.

There is one bus stop within 1/4 mile of the site. There is "demand responsive" service as well as intercity service to Fresno-Clovis metropolitan area.

The proposed site is located on Belmont near the intersection of Eighth Street and very close to Derrick Ave (Hwy 33 - 4,750 vehicles / day south of Derrick and Belmont & 13,800 nine blocks north of the site).

There will be 79 parking spaces on the site and there will probably be additional parking off-site in the future when surrounding developments are in place.

There are 12 bicycle parking spaces on site near the front entrance, but they do not appear to be sheltered.

The library, if built, will be one of the most prominent buildings in town.

The conceptual plans and application form show a plan to expand both the library building and the parking!

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### Mendota Branch Library 2026

#### R2:

Although the site is at the northeast corner of the city (and growth is to be to the south of the city), the site location at Belmont and Derrick (State 33) appears to be the major intersection in Mendota. Grocery shopping, schools, civic buildings are all in this core area, removed as it may be from the center of residence. Adding the Library to the new High School will enhance the magnet aspects of the area.

A Westside Transit bus stop on Derrick (State 33) is about 1,250 feet from the site; its route through Mendota is not shown. Mendota Transit has on-call local service.

Some sidewalks are in. No bicycle facilitation provided. Auto access is uncongested, right on the major highway (Rte. 33) and convenient to other nearby shopping, school and civic destinations. Parking exceeds code by 18%, which should be more than adequate, even though there is no overflow space in case of peak demand (on-street parking is available). 12 bike racks should be okay, although they are unsheltered and unsupervised.

The design and siting gives the Library a prominent presence that will be hard to miss for anyone driving to the many destinations in the vicinity.

Site selection was primarily by public agencies. Following its selection, the site was presented at public meetings for public input and validation. A large site and a not-quite rectangular building with a good interior layout should work well. The location of expansion for both building and parking is shown and is workable.

#### R3:

The proposed site provides excellent access for residents in the agricultural areas surrounding Mendota via Highway 33 (Derrick) and Belmont. Access for some city residents will be less convenient since the proposed site is on the edge of the built area, several blocks from the city's center. Public transit is sparse in this rural area, but what exists is convenient to the site. There are no current bicycle paths or lanes, but a rural bikeway is planned. A side walk connects the proposed site with the high school and crosswalks are planned. Automobile access is easy and convenient from Highway 33 and from the city via diagonal grid that feeds to Belmont. Parking is excellent with 79 spaces, all on site/off street. Traffic circulation in the parking area is well thought out, with disabled van space reserved and a convenient drop off area. 12 bicycle spaces are provided, though none appear to be sheltered. Parking plans include secure space for a bookmobile and a powered area for county mobile services (dental, mental health, and shot mobile). Visibility is excellent from Belmont and Derrick and should be even better if Highway 180 is realigned as expected. The site is adjacent to the high school and close to Mendota's three grocery stores. Though the site is on the edge of current development, the site is envisioned as part of the center of future development in the area. Plans include provision for future expansion of both the facility and parking on the site.

EVALUATION FORM  
**Mendota Branch Library 2026**

***Financial Capacity***

Regulatory Basis: Bond Act p. 5, Section 19998 (a) (7)

**Rating Panel Comments:**